

P. O. BOX 345 NORTH MANCHESTER INDIANA 46962 AREA 219 982-2191



August 11, 1983

EPA Region 5 Records Ctr.

282885

Division of Land Pollution Control State Board of Health 1330 W. Michigan Street P.O. Box 1964 Indianapolis, Indiana 46206-1964

Attention: Mr. David Koepper

SUBJECT: INDUSTRIAL LANDFILL AT OUR PLANT

Dear Sir:

Please consider this as a formal request for extension for compliance time per your Mr. Doyle's letter of July 25, 1983.

We have retained "RMT" who has now taken 18 samples of various materials and they are in process of performing various studies at great cost to an already cost/price burdened operation. This testing is expected to be completed at, as what is still an undetermined time.

Secondly, we are sorting weighing and retaining for a period of 30 days, all wastes so that proper determinations can be made as to composite averages. As noted on page 3 of the "RMT" letter, we believe it will be about 6 more weeks before all of this data will be summarized for our final report as it refers to your first request in Mr. Doyles letter.

As to your Item 2 - We are collecting for future reference the specific materials. In view of this, I don't see how we can cease operations short of shutting down. You further suggest restricting access. We already consider access to be significantly restricted. We are boardered by rivers, fences, and a street of which all access is guarded by either fence, office building or our parking lot. Likewise, we have numerous signs warning against tresspassing. Also be advised, that we have added significantly more signs. A photo of one such sign is included.

In conclusion, we are asking your cooperation for an extension until October 1, 1983.

We Thank you for your cooperations in this matter, which we regard with great concern.

Respectfully, NORTH MANCHESTER FOUNDRY, INC.

R. Westman

RW:lu

enclosures - RMT Letter

- Photo



Residuals Management Technology, Inc.

Great Lakes Office P.O. Box 447 Grand Ledge, Michigan 48837 (517) 627-3991

August 9, 1983

North Manchester Foundry Div. 205 Wabash Road P.O. Box 345 North Manchester, Indiana 46962

Attention: Mr. Rolf Westman

Dear Rolf: .

Regarding our telephone conversation on August 5, 1983, we thank you for your verbal authorization to proceed with the testing of the waste samples collected on August 4, 1983 with your Mr. John Eaton.

The samples collected and their respective areas are as follows:

- 1. Shell Core Butts and Shell Waste Sand core room
- 2. Black Sand Core Butts and Riddlings core room
- 3. Isocure Core Butts and Waste Isocure Sand core room
- 4. Oil Sand Core Butts and Waste Oil Sand core room
- 5. Excess Sand from Foundry System foundry sand system
- 6. Floor Sweeper Wastes representative of overall plant
- 7. Slag from Furnace (Gray Iron) outside melting area
- 8. Ladle Slag (Gray Iron) inside melting area
- 9. Pangborn Separated Waste cleaning room
- 10. Wheelabrator Separated Waste cleaning room
- 11. South Dust Collector Waste grinding room
- 12. North Dust Collector Waste 3 grinders and sand system
- 13. Wheelabrator Separated Waste (near heat treat) cleaning room
- 14. Wheelabrator Dust Collector Waste (near heat treat) cleaning room
- 15. Ladle slag waste (stainless steel operation) inside melting area
- 16. Iron Furnace Refractory on site landfill
- 17. Stainless Steel Furnace Refractory on site landfill
- 18. Pattern Shop Dust Collector pattern shop
  Note: Sample #18 is not applicable for testing at this time.

Based on Friday's conversation RMT will be performing the following coven (7) tests:

1. EP Toxicity Test — Composite 1 — This would be a composite test of the 17 wastes, generated at North Manchester Foundry, under those parameters specified by regulations and for phenois, manganese, iron, zinc and copper because these parameters are of specific regulatory concern with regard to foundry waste disposal.

North Manchester Foundry Div. August 9, 1983 Page Two

- 2. EP Water Test Composite 2 This would be a composite test of the 17 wastes to determine whether the waste is hazardous under state and federal hazardous waste criteria. This composite will be analyzed for the full list of 24 parameters.
- 3. EP Toxicity Test Composite 3 This composite test of shell core butts and shell waste sand; black sand core butts and riddlings; isocure core butts and waste isocure sand; oil sand core butts and waste oil sand will be done to determine whether the waste is hazardous under state and federal hazardous waste criteria.
- 4. EP Toxicity Test Composite 4 This composite test of excess sand from the foundry system and floor sweeper wastes will be done to determine whether the waste is hazardous under state and federal hazardous waste criteria.
- 5. EP Toxicity Test Composite 5 This composite test of slag from furnace (gray iron); ladle slag from gray iron; slag from stainless steel; gray iron furnace refractory; and stainless steel refractory will be done to determine whether the waste is hazardous under state and federal hazardous waste criteria.
- 6. EP Toxicity Test Composite 6 This composite test of Pangborn separated waste; Wheelabrator separated waste; south dust collector waste; north dust collector waste; Wheelabrator separated waste (near heat treat); and Wheelabrator dust collector waste (near heat treat) will be done to determine whether the waste is hazardous under state and federal hazardous waste criteria.
- 7. EP Toxicity Test Test 7 This test would concern only the stainless steel slag and would be tested under applicable parameters.

The purpose of the above mentioned testing will be to establish the following:

 $x_{i+1}, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_{i+1}$ 

- 1. Determine whether the waste is hazardous under state and federal hazardous waste criteria.
- 2. Give some indication of the next step that North Manchester Foundry should consider regarding their on-site landfill.

Based on the scope of work listed above, the cost is estimated to be \$2,500.00 to \$2,800.00.

#### General Conditions

- 1. Our professional services and expenses are to be invoiced on the basis of the RMT Schedule Of Charges current at the time of invoicing.
- 2. Payment terms are net 20 days. Thereafter, 13% interest per month on unpaid balance or at the prime rate plus 13%, whichever is higher.

North Manchester Foundry Div. August 9, 1983 Page Three

As soon as RMT receives the figures regarding estimated weights of the 17 wastes generated we will perform composite test 1 and 2. As of today, we are proceeding with tests 3,4,5,6 and 7.

We thank you for your interest in RMT and we look forward to working with you on this project.

Very truly yours,

Thomas J. Jancek Process Consultant

TJJ/tck

cc: M. Smith

P. Duranceau

T. Kunes

R. Zayko



Residuals Management Technology, Inc.

Great Lakes Office P.O. Box 447 Grand Ledge, Michigan 48837 (517) 627-3991

August 29, 1983

Division of Land Pollution Control State Board of Health 1330 W. Michigan Street P.O. Box 1964 Indianapolis, Indiana 46206-1964

Attention: Mr. David Koepper

Dear Dave:

Relative to our recent conversation I would like to give you some background on why various test procedures for North Manchester Foundry have been determined.

As you know, we have worked for a multitude of foundries located in some 25 states. We are very aware of foundry processes and with this background and knowledge we have selected various test parameters and waste materials that should be evaluated at North Manchester.

These are summarized as follows:

1. EP Toxicity Test - Composite 1

This would be a composite test of the 17 wastes, generated at North Manchester Foundry, under those parameters specified by regulations and for phenols, manganese, iron, zinc and copper because these parameters are of specific regulatory, concern with regard to foundry waste disposal.

This test documents that the composite waste in its mixed form as it goes into the monofill is hazardous or non-hazardous.

2. EP Water Test - Composite 2

This would be a composite test of the 17 wastes with a modified EP toxicity test using deionized water with no pH adjustment.

This test is identical to the EP toxicity test except that de-ionized water is used instead of acetic acid as the leaching medium. This test procedure is consistent with Indiana's policy on characterization and classification of foundry sand.

This test is important for two reasons. First, it is more representative of actual leaching conditions in a segregated foundry waste landfill (monofill). Secondly, many metals are increasingly soluable under acidic conditions. Thus comparison of leaching test results using both acidic and nonacidic conditions can be useful in evaluating the difference in potential environmental impact under different disposal conditions.



1131-2000

Division of Land Pollution Control August 29, 1983 Page Two

Based on our past experience testing the composite foundry waste samples gives a better indication of the leaching potential of wastes when disposed in mixed form in a foundry waste landfill (monofill) than individual sample analysis.

## 3. EP Toxicity Test - Composite 3

This composite test of shell core butts and shell waste sand, black sand core butts and riddlings; isocure core butts and waste isocure sand; oil sand core butts and waste oil sand will be done to determine whether the waste is hazardous under state and federal hazardous waste criteria.

This composite was selected based on our knowledge of foundry processes and the waste constituents in them. These materials all generally have a low leaching potential and have many of the same process characteristics.

## 4. EP Toxicity Test - Composite 4

This composite test of excess sand from the foundry system and floor sweeper wastes will be done to determine whether the waste is hazardous under state and federal hazardous waste criteria.

This composite was selected based on our knowledge of foundry processes and the waste constituents in them. These materials all generally have a low leaching potential and have many of the same process characteristics.

#### 5. EP Toxicity Test - Composite 5

This composite test of slag from furnace (gray iron); ladle slag from gray iron; slag from stainless steel; gray iron furnace refractory; and stainless steel refractory will be done to determine whether the waste is hazardous under state and federal hazardous waste criteria.

This composite was selected based on our knowledge of foundry processes and the waste constituents in them. These materials all generally have a low leaching potential and have many of the same process characteristics.

## 6. EP Toxicity Test - Composite 6

This composite test of Pangborn shot separated waste; Wheelabrator shot separated waste; south dust collector waste; north dust collector waste; Wheelabrator shot separated waste (near heat treat); and Wheelabrator dust collector waste (near heat treat) will be done to determine whether the waste is hazardous under state and federal hazardous waste criteria.

This composite was selected based on our knowledge of foundry processes and the waste constituents in them. These materials all generally have a low leaching potential and have many of the same process characteristics.

Division of Land Pollution Control August 29, 1983 Page Three

## 7. EP Toxicity Test - Test 7

This test would concern only the stainless steel slag and would be tested according to applicable parameters.

Based on our overall experience in the foundry industry and knowledge of foundry process we do not feel that individual waste testing is applicable at this time. If the above testing program shows any parameters of concern then applicable individual test would be done on the wastes in question.

If you have further questions relative to the above please call me at your convenience.

We are presently holding up the North Manchester Foundry testing program until we receive agreement from you relative to our proposed testing program.

Very truly yours,

Robert E. Zayko, P.E.

Manager, Great Lakes Office

REZ/tck

cc: T. Jancek

RMT - Madison Rolf Westman



Residuals Management Technology, Inc.

Great Lakes Office P.O. Box 447 Grand Ledge, Michigan 48837 (517) 627-3991

August 9, 1983

North Manchester Foundry Div. 205 Wabash Road P.O. Box 345 North Manchester, Indiana 46962

Attention: Mr. Rolf Westman

Dear Rolf:

Regarding our telephone conversation on August 5, 1983, we thank you for your verbal authorization to proceed with the testing of the waste samples collected on August 4, 1983 with your Mr. John Eaton.

The samples collected and their respective areas are as follows:

- 1. Shell Core Butts and Shell Waste Sand core room
- 2. Black Sand Core Butts and Riddlings core room
- 3. Isocure Core Butts and Waste Isocure Sand core room
- 4. Oil Sand Core Butts and Waste Oil Sand core room
- 5. Excess Sand from Foundry System foundry sand system
- 6. Floor Sweeper Wastes representative of overall plant
- 7. Slag from Furnace (Gray Iron) outside melting area
- 8. Ladle Slag (Gray Iron) inside melting area
- 9. Pangborn Separated Waste cleaning room
- 10. Wheelabrator Separated Waste cleaning room
- 11. South Dast Collector Waste grinding room
- 12. North Dust Collector Waste 3 grinders and sand system
- 13. Wheelabrator Separated Waste (near heat treat) cleaning room
- -14. Wheelabrator Dust Collector Waste (near heat treat) cleaning room
- 15. Ladle slag waste (stainless steel operation) inside melting area
- 16. Iron Furnace Refractory on site landfill

1977年1982年中華新聞出版的 海流量學學出

- 17. Stainless Steel Furnace Refractory on site landfill
- 18. Pattern Shop Dust Collector pattern shop
  Note: Sample #18 is not applicable for testing at this time.

Based on Friday's conversation RMT will be performing the following seven (7) tests:

1. EP Toxicity Test - Composite 1 - This would be a composite test of the 17 wastes, generated at North Manchester Foundry, under those parameters specified by regulations and for phenols, manganese, iron, zinc and copper because these parameters are of specific regulatory concern with regard to foundry waste disposal.

Allo Y DO HAND STATE OF THE PARTY OF THE PAR



P. O. BOX 345 NORTH MANCHESTER INDIANA 46962 AREA 219 982-2191



August 1, 1983

Division of Land Pollution Control State Board of Health 1330 M. Michigan Street P.O. Box 1964 Indianapolis, Indiana 46206-1964

Attention: Mr. David Koepper

SUBJECT: INDUSTRIAL LANDFILL AT OUR PLANT

Dear Ir. Koepper:

Phoase consider this as our first response to your Nr. Doyle's letter of July 25, 1983.

In order that we respond to your requestes in a proper and most expedient manner, we have contacted a consultant organization, that we are told, are experts in this field. This Company (NMT of Grand Ledge, Michigan) will guide us in the required testing and procedures, so that any results to be reported to you in the coming weeks will be without question as to validity.

We will do everything possible to meet all of our so called obligations under the law, but we suspicion (at this time), that we might not be able to accumulate all necessary data within the period required. Is your department open to any extensions on compliance dates?

Respectfully, HORTH HANCHESTER FOUNDRY, INC.

Rolf Westman

RM: Lu

co: RIT-Nr. Robert Zayko

JUL 2 5 1983

# VIA CERTIFIED MAIL

Mr. Rolf Westman North Manchester Foundry P.O. Box 345 North Manchester, IN 46962

Dear Mr. Westman:

Re: RCRA Inspection
North Manchester Foundry

The Environmental Management Board is cooperating with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region V, in carrying out the provisions of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, Public Law 94-580 (RCRA). In this effort, representatives of the Environmental Management Board are conducting inspections of facilities in Indiana that are engaged in the generation, transportation, treatment, storage, or disposal of hazardous waste. In addition to RCRA requirements, facilities are being inspected to determine compliance with Environmental Management Board 320 IAC 4, "Hazardous Waste Management Permit Program and Related Hazardous Waste Management Requirements."

This letter is to inform you that on July 12, 1983, an inspection of North Manchester Foundry, located in North Manchester, Indiana, was conducted by Mr. David Koepper of the Division of Land Pollution Control, Indiana State Board of Health. You represented your firm at this inspection.

The following violation of RCRA and 320 IAC 4 pertaining to the operation of your facility was noted:

40 CFR 262.11

Generator has not determined if waste is

and hazardous.

320 IAC 4-4-1

The inspection also revealed that open dumping is taking place. Open dumping is a violation of Environmental Management Act 13-7 and, if the waste is hazardous, 320 IAC 4.

North Manchester Foundry, within 30 calendar days of receipt of this letter, shall achieve compliance with the following requirements:

- 1. Determine if the waste generated is hazardous as defined by Subparts C and D of 40 CFR 261 and 320 IAC 4-3-1. (If you believe the waste is not hazardous, include evidence to support your decision.)
- 2. All open dumping must cease and access to the site must be restricted.

Your Company shall submit to this office, within 35 calendar days of receipt of this letter, a written detailed explanation of the steps taken to achieve compliance. The letter shall state the date compliance was achieved.

Please direct your response to this letter and any questions to Mr. David Koepper of the Division of Land Pollution Control, Indiana State Board of Health, 317/633-0398.

Very truly yours

Guinn Doyle, Chief

Hazardous Waste Management Branch Division of Land Pollution Control

DJK/tr Enclosure

cc: Wabash County Health Department

tr 6370m 7/20/83

	NOTICE OF VIOLATION REVIEW/CLOSE OUT
PACI	LITY: North Manchester Foundry DATE INSPECTED: 7/12/83
LOCA	TION: North Manchaster DATE RESPONSE: 8/1/83 to the
I.D.	DATE OF REVIEW: 5/21/83
G ENEI	RATOR [ ] TRANSPORTER [ ] TSD [ ]
COMMI	ENTS ON INSPECTION: 1st inspection   followup []
ے پر پر	sis of response  senerator had all baste sircums on site analyzed, lone were tound to be hazardous. Now!  explicitly solid heste exemption site  equest for the dump site
ACTIO	N TAKEN
ı bot	RETURNED TO COMPLIANCE
2 [ ]	ADDITIONAL TIME REQUESTED (recommendations in analysis section)
3 [ ]	FOLLOWUP INSPECTION RECOMMENDED
4 [ ]	RECOMMEND ENFORCEMENT ACTION  !!!DON*T FORGET STATUS LOG! !!  REVIEWER'S NAME

SECTION CHIEF

